

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE
UNIVERSITY SENATE
1964 - 1965

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE
UNIVERSITY SENATE - 1964-65

The untimely death of President Carroll in the summer of 1964 cast its shadow over the beginning of the academic year and the resumption of work by the University Senate in the Fall.

Shortly after President Carroll's death, it had become clear that, under the principles laid down by the Faculty Code, steps would have to be taken to prepare for the effective participation of the Faculty in the selection of the new President. Messrs. Wise, Wood, Seidelson and Fox, the members of the Senate Executive Committee available in Washington during the latter part of the summer, at the request of the Board of Trustees, served as an interim committee to aid and advise the Board of Trustees. In the absence of specific code procedures for this purpose, the Executive Committee acted as a nominating committee to put an appropriate slate before the Faculty Assembly on September 16, 1964. Having accepted this procedure, the Faculty Assembly elected the nominees to serve as members of the Committee to Advise and Counsel with the Board of Trustees in the selection of the President. This Committee composed of Richard F. Ericson, John Kaye, Elmer Kayser, Hugh LeBlanc, Arthur Miller, Carol R. St. Cyr, William Schmidt, Edwin Stevens, Robert H. Walker and under the Chairmanship of Dr. Thomas M. Brown has since served in this capacity and given account of its stewardship to the Faculty Assembly in two interim reports, the last of which was submitted on February 17, 1965.

Among the important matters with which the Senate had to concern itself during the past academic year, certain aspects stand out in retrospect. In view of the state of the University in a critical period of transition, a searching reconsideration of our needs in relation to the changing composition of the student body appeared urgent. University functions and purposes needed to be reviewed in the light of available and potential human, physical and financial resources. Toward this end, an administrative report entitled Basic Considerations Underlying an Academic Plan, signed by all the Deans of the University had been prepared early this year which, after it had been made available to the Senate University Objectives Committee, became the basis of a thoughtful and thought-provoking report by that Committee. That report, reflecting a spirit of candor and realism, and deriving much encouragement from the administrative document before it, states in its conclusion: "We know what her (the University's) problems are, and we know how serious they are If within our century the University is going to realize her potential, vigorous and creative attention must be given to every one of these problems, and the work must begin at once. We wish to conclude by underscoring our own sense of urgency, even impatience; there is not a minute to lose." We also direct attention to the Committee's request that the report "Basic Considerations, etc." be made available to each member of the University Senate. This recommendation highlights the Senate's awkward position in a meaningful discussion of a report based on another unavailable report.

The same sense of urgency also marks the report of a Committee such as that on Physical Facilities which notes a "sense of disquietude" among students and faculty concerning the state of some physical facilities and the observable lack of communication on relevant planning.

Related to the general preoccupation with changes in the University has been the mounting concern with student life and opportunities in the light of the transformation of the student body. The Senate Committee on Student Relations has addressed itself to some specific aspects of the matter, as have other committees. Our concern was

given further impetus by the vigorous manifestations of student discontent and of the students' desire to be given a more adequate place in the University community which came to a head in April. The Senate arranged to hear the President of the Student Government, Skip Gnehm, and adopted a resolution declaring its whole-hearted approval of the expression of needs and objectives transmitted by the student leaders to the Board of Trustees. That the activities of the student leaders led to a meeting with members of the Board of Trustees is to be greatly welcomed. Yet it is our hope that also without the incentive of special incidents, channels of communication between student representatives, faculty and administration, and the Board of Trustees will be the rule rather than the exception in the future.

Similarly, the Senate had cause to reassess the condition and role of the Faculty in the University. A strong stand was taken on the matter of Faculty salaries by the adoption of two successive resolutions urging the Board of Trustees to initiate significant raises in the Faculty salary levels without delay. A parallel concern is reflected in the significant report of the Senate Sub-Committee on Retirement which proposed raising the retirement age, along with some other related measures. A report from the Committee on Appointments, Salaries and Promotion Policies which gives evidence of the widespread desire for a disability insurance plan points in the same direction. The Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom calls for an increasing "adherence to the standards of the academic community" within the University. While it warns against "creeping encroachments" on academic freedom through indirect methods, it asks for a closer examination of the substance of the faculty members' academic responsibility. The useful recommendations of the Committee on Administrative Matters should also be appraised in this context. They emphasize the need for readily available information on University procedures and resources and the desirability of further improvement in the orientation arrangements for new members of the academic community.

The problem of research as it affects both teachers and students was reviewed in the light of current University conditions. The Committee on Research has devoted a vigorous and stimulating report to some key problems which we commend to the attention of all concerned. It is clear that the interaction of research, teaching and teaching load, grants and salaries is a matter which will continue to require steady attention. Directly related to this is the problem of library facilities to which the Library Committee's report has given its careful attention. Its significant recommendations merit our support.

The problem of intercollegiate football had been under consideration for the preceding two academic years by the Senate Athletic Committee, resulting in the divided Seidelson Report of May 1964. The Ad Hoc Committee instituted at that time and composed of Herman H. Hobbs, John P. Reesing, John W. Skinner, Ira R. Telford, Robert C. Vincent, J. Forrester Davison, Chairman, and Wolfgang H. Kraus, ex officio, has continued the inquiry under Professor Davison's leadership. Its weighty findings and recommendations proposing the termination of subsidized intercollegiate football and the effective use of funds thus released to intramural sports and other recreational facilities have been adopted by the Senate. This constitutes a strong recommendation to the Board of Trustees made after the most careful consideration and in full appreciation of both material and immaterial interests which are at stake. These recommendations include the procedural proposal that no final action be taken by the University without adequate consultation with student leaders who are to be provided simultaneously with the relevant financial information. The heat and passion which seem to be inescapable in this area have already led to bitter private and public attack upon the Chairman of the Executive Committee who had served as an ex-officio member of the Ad Hoc Committee.

It is worthy of note that the work of the Ad Hoc Committee (as of its precursor, last year's Athletics Committee) brought out the growing importance of good working relationships between Senate Committees, officers of the Administration and the

Board of Trustees Committees, whether formalized or not. Only through such a cooperative approach was it possible to gather and share significant data, including the results of a broad-ranging sample poll conducted among the student body under the auspices of the Senate Executive Committee. Such relationships will and must increase in the future in ease and importance.

We wish to direct attention to some general questions pertinent to the present and future work of the Senate. To begin with, we would like to express our satisfaction with the significant amendments to the Faculty Organization Plan adopted by the Faculty Assembly which will materially contribute to the better functioning of the Senate. The assumption of responsibility both by the Executive Committee and the standing committees of the Senate at the end of the academic year strikes us as especially constructive. We hope that this will enable not only the Executive Committee itself, but especially the Standing Committees to become active with much less delay than has so far been the case. Several committees appear to have experienced special difficulties during the last academic year in proceeding with their business or in presenting final reports. This is due to a variety of reasons including excessive committee burdens which may make a re-examination of the present pattern of standing committees desirable.

The whole matter of communication between the Senate, the Faculty in general, the Officers of Administration, the students and the Board of Trustees has been and must continue to be a matter of grave concern. While we note some significant improvements in this area, much remains to be done which should not be left to improvisation, as heretofore.

Some thought should be given also to the role of the President of the University, as presiding officer of the Senate. Experience suggests that it would be wise to resume the earlier practice that, at each session, substantial parts of the agenda be turned over by the President to the chairmanship of the Chairman of the Executive Committee. This has the twofold advantage that the Chairman's position becomes more meaningful and that the President is freer to enter into the discussion without undue strain upon his role as impartial chairman. It is our hope that, in the coming academic year, the new Senate and the Faculty Assembly may have an opportunity to consider the important question of Faculty representation, direct or indirect, in the meetings of the Board of Trustees. Many informed observers of University government believe that such an arrangement, which exists in a number of sister institutions, holds promise of a more closely-knit University community.

In conclusion, we wish to express our deep concern that despite the efforts of those charged with this task, the vacancy in the University presidency continues at the end of the academic year, apparently without a solution in sight. We are convinced that, for the sake of the University's welfare, a speedy resolution of this impasse has become imperative.

Respectfully submitted,

The Executive Committee of the
University Senate,

Wolfgang H. Kraus, Chairman
Raymond R. Fox
David E. Seidelson
Charles S. Wise
Reuben E. Wood

Oswald S. Colclough, Acting President,
ex officio

To: The University Senate

May 3, 1965

From: Senate Committee on Admissions and Advanced Standing

Subject: Report and Recommendations

The Senate Committee on Admissions and Advanced Standing respectfully submits the following report. The committee has been assisted in its work by Dr. Sally Shanes and Mr. George Stoner who served as consultants.

Members of the committee have noted with pleasure and satisfaction the adoption of one of the two principal recommendations of last year's committee concerning deadlines for the receipt of applications for admission to degree candidacy.

The committee in its initial session met with Vice President Brown, Dean Linton, and Dean Mason. A broad discussion was held of admissions problems and practices. Vice President Brown later covered much of this discussion in a report to the Faculty Assembly which was also printed in the University Hatchet.

The committee selected for study the area of admission and readmission of students on suspension. The handling of certain types of applications according to a strict interpretation of present policy results in severe inequities. Although it is possible to avoid such inequities by acting "outside" of or by making exceptions to policy, it is the committee's opinion that it is desirable to state policy in terms broad enough to recognize the unusual situations, thus permitting us to cope with them within rather than outside the policy's framework. The committee believes that some flexibility can be provided in our present rather rigid policy without in any way lowering our academic standards. These recommendations concern a limited but increasing number of cases, but the committee considers these important in the interest of avoiding inequities and also of bringing our practices in line with comparable universities.

Members of the committee have been interested in counseling presently being done by members of the faculty of the School of Engineering in working with students on probation in an effort to assist the students in avoiding academic suspension. The University's Psychological Clinic has been utilized in this program.

The Committee on Admissions and Advanced Standing requests that the Senate approve the following recommendations for transmittal to the faculties concerned for appropriate considerations:

1. That the appropriate faculty committees consider the adoption of two types of academic suspension:
 - a. A permanent severance for those cases in which an appropriate committee has determined that in the best interests of the student and the University the student's candidacy for a degree should be permanently terminated.
 - b. A temporary suspension of one or more semesters which establishes a remedial program (possibly including referral to the University Psychological Clinic) outlining what the student must do to qualify for readmission.
2. That the present policy regarding admission or readmission of students on suspension remain essentially the same (a waiting period of one year) with the proviso that in unusual and exceptional circumstances, upon recommendation of the Director of Admissions and approval of the appropriate faculty committee, a student may be admitted or readmitted after a waiting period of one semester.
3. That we modify the present policy which provides that no credit may be allowed for courses completed at another institution during the year following

suspension of (a) students from this University who apply for readmission, or
(b) students who apply for admission from other institutions. We recommend
that in exceptional cases, upon recommendation of the Director of Admissions
and the approval of the appropriate faculty committee, full, partial, or
provisional credit be assigned.

A.C. Meltzer

Margaret Montzka

R.H. Moore

Edith Mortensen

R.B. Lestin, Chairman

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AS THEY AFFECT THE
FACULTY

During the year 1964-65 the Committee has concerned itself primarily with two matters:

1. Multiple Assignments as they affect the faculty.
2. Orientation program for new faculty members.

The Committee is making the following recommendations to the University Senate:

1. Multiple Assignments as they affect the faculty.

Due to the manner in which the University is organized into schools and divisions, most faculty members provide service in different areas whose separation is a matter of administrative convenience. In spite of this, only one Dean is generally responsible for an academic appointment even if it is understood that service will be provided in areas outside his jurisdiction.

The Committee recommends to the University Senate, the procedures below in order to provide a better basis for the understanding of a faculty member's varied contributions to the University.

- a) That the Annual Report of a Faculty Member form be so modified as to include a space for the individual faculty member to indicate which departmental chairman, committee chairmen, deans, or other officials of the university should be asked to provide a confidential evaluation of his report such as the front page of the form entitled CONFIDENTIAL Recommendations and Comments to be Attached to the Annual Personal Report of _____.
- b) That the Annual Report of a Faculty Member be distributed to all such persons named as in (a) with an appropriate form for the confidential evaluation and be returned to the dean of faculties.

- c) That the aforesaid confidential evaluations be collated and attached to the original of the Annual Report of a Faculty Member before review by the dean of faculties.
- d) That these documents remain together as they are forwarded to the President, and the Board of Trustees.

2. Orientation Program for new Faculty.

- A. A Handbook
- B. Continuation and expansion of the orientation program started in September, 1964.

The Handbook should be a convenient loose-leaf type notebook so pages could be easily changed as might be needed. Deans and Administrative Officers (Comptroller, Registrar, Director of Admissions, etc.) should be contacted for information they feel important for the handbook. General material should be placed in each handbook, individual schools and departments should add specific information for their own faculty members, which is unique to their organization and operation. Some of the items to be included are as follows:

I. General Information.

A brief History of the University

- 1. General
- 2. Specific for divisions

II. Academic Procedures.

- A. Admissions
- B. Registration
- C. Scholarship
 - 1. probation
 - 2. withdrawals

III. Faculty

- A. Fringe Benefits
 - 1. T. I. A. A.
 - 2. C. R. E. F.
- B. Pay arrangements.
- C. Health Facilities.
- D. Life Insurance
- E. Free tuition for children of faculty members.

IV. Business Office.

- A. Faculty Club
- B. Parking Facilities
- C. Emergency information
 - 1. accidents - day and evening
- D. Room changes - day and evening
- E. Examination conflicts

V. Publications

- A. List of Annual University Publications
- B. Listing of various catalogs

VI. Committees

- A. Senate
- B. Standing Committees

VII. Personnel Office

- A. Full and Part-Time Secretarial help.
- B. Laboratory assistants

VIII. Organizations

- A. Listing of ~~National~~ organizations with local chapters.
- B. Name of President - address and telephone number.
 - 1. Name of President's secretary.

IX. Library Facilities

A. Faculty privileges

B. Faculty cubicles.

Respectfully submitted,

John G. Allee, Jr.

Otto Bergman

Robert C. Cronin

Charles S. Tidball

Carol E. St. Cyr, Chairman

William D. Johnson, ex officio

I ARTICLE X of the CODE:

The Committee started its 1964-65 life by surveying plans, existing or presently being formulated, to implement Article X of the Code and Ordinances governing academic personnel of The George Washington University.

The following letter was sent to all deans and department heads:

"A new Senate Committee for Appointments (etc.) was constituted on October 9, 1964 for a period of 1 year. For the first time a set of codes and ordinances exists which officially outlines and encourages faculty participation in matters pertaining to Appointments, etc., as stated in Article X, and detailed on pages 18 and 19.

The exercise of and the results of such participation will create a university environment from which this and future committees must draw substance for examining what has been accomplished and what future changes are needed in policy affecting normal types of appointments and promotions etc. as stated in Article X.

This Committee is surveying the manner in which each school and their separate departments plans to implement Article X of the Code and Ordinances from either existing or contemplated departmental faculty councils.

This Senate Committee would welcome receiving your reply by January 5, 1965. In conducting this survey no reply will be catalogued as "no present plans to implement paragraphs A and B of Article X."

All active departments replied. Where ambiguity or obvious lack of conformity with the code existed the Committee carried on further communications until it became clear that no misunderstanding or deliberate circumvention of the code existed in regard to Article X and the Principles, Standards, and Procedures for their implementation.

The Committee is pleased to report that as of 1965 all apparent non-conformity with Article X of the Code has been or is in the process of being eliminated.

Instructions will be submitted to the 1966 Committee on Appointments, Salary, and Promotion Policy to follow-up the status of departments that have not yet, as of this date, finalized their procedure for implementing Article X.

II. THE STATE OF FACULTY CONCERN WITH SALARY POLICY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO MAJOR PARAMETERS IN UNIVERSITY LIFE:

The Committee set forth to gather data on the Faculty's views on salary. The following questionnaire was sent to every full-time faculty member active or on leave:

TO:

All Full Time Faculty Members

FROM:

Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies

SUBJECT:

Survey to Determine the Existence or Lack of Existence of a Majority Faculty Opinion on Factors Dealing with Salary Structure that Can Aid the Administration in Future Planning.

The aforementioned, presently constituted Senate committee has a life time of one year. It came into being with a strong background of achievement in faculty fringe benefits; a set of guidelines for appointments and promotion policies set forth in the Code and Ordinances dated Sept. 1, 1964, but with no inheritance of administratively formulated guidelines or stated faculty opinions on the sensitive subject of salary policy.

This committee, regarding itself as one of the direct links between the executive and teaching branches of our university, is of the opinion that of the many factors needed in evaluating salary policies, the one missing which this committee can supply is the attitude of the majority of our full time faculty members.

As chairman of the Senate committee concerned with salary policies, I would welcome your cooperation in this survey of faculty opinion by your answering the following questions:

	YES	NO	NO OPINION OR COMMENT
--	-----	----	-----------------------

I. Faculty salary structure as a whole is a major factor affecting teaching morale.

168	15	4
-----	----	---

II. The faculty salary structure as a whole is an important gauge used by the public in evaluating teaching competency.

130	32	25
-----	----	----

III. Levels of and adjustments in an individual's salary are the concern of only the administration and himself.

49	126	10
----	-----	----

IV. Disparity in salaries, for equal rank and experience among various schools, is a major source of majority discontent at this university.

80	35	72
----	----	----

V. Disparity of salaries at my rank and experience is a personal source of discontent on my part.

59	100	28
----	-----	----

VI. Salary policy should reflect the needs and physical growth of a university.

137	13	37
-----	----	----

VII. A specialized group other than this Senate Committee should help formulate and present faculty opinion on salaries to the University's executive members and Board of Trustees.

40	73	74
----	----	----

VIII. Salary policy should include factors proportional to local community economic costs.

152	12	23
-----	----	----

IX. Salary policy should reflect a regional per capita average.

28	73	86
----	----	----

X. I would supply this committee with my university salary and rank for its Confidential use on request.

165	19	3
-----	----	---

YES

NO

No Opinion or
Comment

21.

I would supply, if requested, my personal university salary and rank to professional organizations such as American Assoc. of University Professors or Middle States Association of Colleges and Universities.

156

24

7

This committee realizes the many questions which can arise in answering the above. We welcome comments and request your reply by January 20, 1964, sent to Dr. R. Heller, Rm. 314, Tompkins Hall, School of Engineering and Applied Science

The total number of replies to the various questions is indicated on the questionnaire. Thirty-eight percent of the Faculty replied, a disappointingly small number. Encompassed in this response are all factors from general apathy due to past experience with the Board of Trustees, to sheer contentment or embarrassment with one's salary, regardless of the status of the group.

However, in spite of the disappointing response to the questionnaire, the Committee took the point of view that steps should be taken to improve the general level of salaries at the University and in particular to promote the adoption by the Board of Trustees of a salary scale policy comparable to salary scales reported by the A.A.U.P. It was believed by the Committee that the adoption of at least minimum salary scales would eliminate gross discrepancies in salaries brought about by economic expediency and individual bargaining. It was also believed that the adoption of, and announcement of, a definite salary scale policy would improve morale and bring favorable publicity to the University. Accordingly, the following resolution was submitted to, and unanimously adopted by the Senate:

"Even a university which is the only non-denominational private institution of higher learning in the Nation's Capital cannot achieve greatness when its salary scale is similar to that of fourth or fifth ranked institutions. Based upon information supplied by the University to the American Association of University Professors, The George Washington University is at the C level (fourth, coming after AA, A, and B) on the AAUP's average salary scale and at the D level (fifth) on the AAUP's minimum salary scale. As the Board of Trustees makes plans for the University's future, it must recognize that raising salary levels to the AAUP's A scales is a necessary condition to achieving greatness.

The faculty realizes that this salary policy cannot be put into effect immediately. The first step in implementing the policy, however, should be the adoption of the AAUP's B minimum salary scale for the academic year 1965-66 and the adoption of a plan for annual salary increases to bring The George Washington University to the A minimum and average salary levels by the academic year 1970-71."

Having received the Senate's resolution, the Board of Trustees passed a resolution forwarded to the Senate stating that it was in sympathy with the resolution of the Senate and that every effort would be made to improve salaries in the future. The Committee's view of this resolution was that it constituted a polite but definite rejection of the Senate's resolution that a definite salary policy be adopted constituting (1) the adoption of the A.A.U.P.'s B minimum salary

scale for the academic year 1965-66 and (2) the adoption of a plan for annual salary increases to bring The George Washington University to the A minimum and average salary levels by the academic year 1970-71. The Senate adopted the following resolution in response to the action of the Board of Trustees:

"The Senate, while appreciating the sentiments expressed in the Board of Trustees' communication on salaries, expects that concrete and affirmative action on advancing salary levels will be taken by the Board with all deliberate speed. It hopes that there will be appropriate consultation of the Board with the Senate Committee."

III. FRINGE BENEFITS -- DISABILITY INSURANCE:

In an attempt to assist the administration in further rounding out the insurance benefit program offered by the University to the Faculty, the following questionnaire was sent to every full-time faculty member:

Dear Colleague:

In the rare instance when total disability strikes a Faculty member, it also intimately involves his family and the University. Disability insurance can provide important help in at least the financial part of the crisis. A University study last year indicated that the cost of group insurance of this kind for the Faculty holding tenure would equal about one percent of the salary of those eligible.

The plan contemplated would not require a physical examination as a prerequisite being insured and would apply to any total disability that continued beyond six months. From then through the duration of the disability, to retirement age if necessary, the plan would pay 60% of the salary of a member earning up to \$1,000 a month, and 40% of salary beyond that figure, so long as the total monthly benefit did not exceed \$1,000. If the insured became eligible for retirement while disabled, he would then receive retirement benefits instead.

Whether the tenure Faculty should share in the cost or whether the University should pay the entire premium is still to be decided. If Faculty members share, it will be necessary to have the participation of 75% of those eligible before the plan can go into effect. In order that the Senate may now inform the Administration regarding current Faculty views in this matter, you are requested to check (✓) the appropriate boxes and return the bottom portion of this page BY FEBRUARY 1, 1965 to:

Dr. Robert B. Heller, Chairman
Senate Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies
314-A Tompkins Hall, The George Washington University
Washington, D. C. 20006

_____ I am interested in having a disability insurance plan for the Faculty.

_____ I am not interested in having a disability insurance plan for the Faculty.

_____ If such a plan is adopted, I am willing to contribute up to, but not more than, one-half of one percent (0.5%) of my annual salary toward the cost.

If such a plan is adopted, I am willing to contribute up to, but not more than, one percent (1%) of my annual salary to the cost.

If such a plan is adopted, I shall not be willing to participate unless the University pays the entire cost.

The Faculty response to this questionnaire was much more gratifying: 260 of the full-time faculty replied. Based upon these replies the following Committee report was forwarded to the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Senate and to the Deans of Faculty:

The enclosed questionnaire was circulated to all full time faculty members whose names appear on the G.W.U. addressograph. Of the 260 replies, which seems to be higher than the average number of replies we obtain by such a procedure, 5% have no interest in a group disability insurance plan.

Ninety-five percent (95%) are definitely desirous of a group disability insurance plan. Of this group, 46.5% are willing to contribute 0.5% of their annual salary; 43.5% up to 1.0% and 10% prefer the University to assume all payments.

It is the Committee's conclusion that based upon this sampling, the Administration can be assured that at least 75% of the full-time faculty will join such a plan based upon a compulsory 0.5% contribution.

With an adequate education program clearly outlining benefits and an expressed position by the Administration, the Committee feels that 75% of the full-time faculty would join a voluntary plan based upon a $\frac{1}{2}$ % contribution.

Following this report and a consultation with Mr. Cantini, the following Committee letter was forwarded to the Dean of Faculties:

"Various elements of the University have been exploring the possibility of providing group disability insurance for tenure Faculty.

In response to a recent questionnaire, 260 of our full time faculty indicated interest in participating in a disability insurance plan. Of these 95% are willing to contribute one-half of one percent of their salary to such a plan. Approximately 45% would be willing to contribute one percent.

The Faculty has benefited greatly by the increase in fringe benefits in recent years. The addition of disability insurance would substantially strengthen the insurance benefit program offered by the University to the Faculty.

The Senate hopes that the Administration will take early favorable action and inaugurate a form of disability insurance for Tenure Faculty."

Dean Bright has informed the Committee that he has conveyed his personal desires as well as the recommendation of this Committee for such a Disability Insurance Plan. At present the TIAA plan appears to be the best because it was specifically made for faculty groups.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS:

At the close of the 1964-65 academic year, the Committee adopted the following recommendations for the succeeding committee members:

1. To make follow-up inquiries regarding the further implementation of ARTICLE X of the CODE.
2. To meet with the appropriate Board of Trustees' Committee to discuss the adoption of a salary scale policy as unanimously recommended by the Senate. To consider further action, such as a non-confidence vote of the Board of Trustees, should the Board of Trustees' Committee fail to meet with this Committee, or fail to cooperate in adopting a definite salary scale policy.
3. To press for adoption of DISABILITY INSURANCE.
4. To inquire into further fringe benefits.

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE

THIS COMMITTEE HELD NO MEETINGS THIS YEAR IN DEFERENCE TO THE AD HOC COMMITTEE WHICH WAS USING ITS REPORT OF LAST YEAR AS THE BASIS FOR ITS WORK IN STUDYING THE INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS PROGRAM OF THE UNIVERSITY.

THIS PAGE THEREFORE REPRESENTS THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE. BY DIRECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN, MR. SKINNER.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE
ON FACULTY PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT
1964-65

The Committee held a number of meetings during the academic year and directed most of its attention to developing methods for the evaluation of each of the five criteria 1) opinion of peers, 2) appraisal of teaching, 3) research and publication 4) administrative service, 5) public and professional service to be considered for appointment and promotion. Most of the attention was devoted to assessment of the teaching effectiveness, with special attention given to student evaluation for administrative decision, but also did consider that such evaluation could be useful to the teacher concerned. If subject evaluation were to be used, it was agreed that evaluation by seniors or alumni would be of significance. The Committee has not yet reached the point where it is ready to make specific recommendations.

Other topics considered by the Committee and which should be studied next year include

- 1 Faculty responsibility for selecting and sponsoring seniors for fellowships and assistantships.
- 2 Adjustment of teaching loads to research output.
- 3 Adjustment of teaching loads to supervision and direction of graduate study and research.
- 4 Limitation on the number of committees on which a faculty member should serve.

Report of the Senate Library Committee

May - 1965

The Library Committee reiterates last year's Committee statement that the effort to improve the capacity of the University as a center of learning can succeed only if, among other things, a much stronger University library system is created. The present weakness of our library system, we wish to emphasize, is a weakness of physical facilities for service. The library staff, according to outside expert observation, as well as our own, has performed remarkably well, given the insufficient number and compensation of staff members and the cramped quarters in which they have had to work.

The Committee has discussed briefly the question of relations between the Main library and present and prospective School and Departmental libraries, but its attention has been given primarily to the condition and future of the Main library.

The Committee urges that consideration be given promptly to making the space in the basement and on the upper three floors of the library building which is presently used for other purposes available to the library. Of course, this space which the library would acquire would be space lost to other present users. Thus, full use by the library of its present building must be considered in the context of the University's overall pattern of space allocation. However, even were the library to fill all of the building in which it is now housed,

-2-

it would not be physically adequate to the purpose of developing services necessary for first-class undergraduate and graduate learning. For these services require not only space for much more substantial holdings and modern processing equipment, but a design more suitable than the present building for freer, direct, yet secure, student access to materials. Hence, University development plans should provide for a new library building to be constructed as soon as possible. We envisage expansion within the present structure as merely a short-term remedy.

Concomitantly with this short-term enlargement of the main library's quarters, the Committee urges the following immediate steps for improvement of library service:

- 1) Enlargement of the library staff, including, especially, additional professionally qualified persons. Among these professionals should be bibliographers who would carry through a survey of present holdings. Indispensable to such staff expansion is a marked upgrading of salary levels for both professional and non-professional members.

- 2) The institution of a procedure of systematic weeding of collections, a desirable thing in itself and especially urgent for our library, in view of the severe shortage of space.

- 3) The acquisition of such mechanical and electronic processing equipment as the Librarian may deem useful and compatible with other equally important uses of available funds.

- 4) A marked increase in the allotment of funds for the purchase of books, periodicals and other printed matter.

- 5) Establishment of an acquisitions policy. This would

require faculty participation, perhaps department-by-department.

6) The Librarian should be empowered to enrich and develop collections without being bound to specific faculty recommendations. This is in addition to the usual purchase of materials in response to departmental orders.

7) With such enlargement of quarters and increase of staff, the University library presumably would be able to meet the conditions for status as a U.S. Government Depository, a status we should seek. The conditions in question are (a) free availability of the materials for public use, and (b) a guarantee of adequate facilities for custody and service. The Librarian of the Law School has made a particular point of his School's need for these materials, but many other units of the University would be equally served.

8) The establishment of a student committee to consult with the Senate library Committee and the librarian, who is an ex officio member of the Senate Committee.

Mr. John Russell Mason, after many years of conscientious service, expects to retire prior to the beginning of the next academic year. And since the Committee has a part to play in the appointment of a Librarian, it has also discussed (1) the kind of background which a Librarian might be expected to bring to a post whose duties would be modified by the expansion of library services which we are recommending; and (2) the functions by which the librarian's position would be distinguished.

Two types of Head librarian suggest themselves. Either type would be a policy-maker, devoted, apart from any disciplinary interest he may have, solely to library matters. However, in the one case, the librarian could be drawn from any scholarly discipline. In this case, an associate selected for his knowledge of, and experience with, the technical facets of library service would have to be appointed for that portion of the work. The heart of the case for a Head librarian of this type is that the position calls, first and foremost, for a person of broad scholarly interests and experience, and that such a person is most likely to come from a career in teaching and scholarship, particularly, but not invariably, in the liberal arts.

The bifurcation of duties which this type of appointment entails, however, carries the danger of conflict of interest and allegiance between the Head librarian and his technical associate. Hence, a case can be made for an appointment under which the Head librarian would be not only the officially-designated policy-maker, but also the undisputed director of all services. On this premise, the Head librarian should be a professional librarian of established reputation, but also a person who has a scholar's and teacher's experience.

The Committee does not recommend the one kind of Head librarian over the other. But it does note that, if the planning of a new library building becomes a reality in the near future, or even if the remainder of the present building is put at the Library's disposal, a principal concern of

Mr. Mason's successor for some time to come will be with physical and technical matters. Hence, the case for a professional librarian who has also a scholar's and teacher's experience may be more appropriate for this University at this time than for certain other universities.

Respectfully submitted

Seymour Alpert

Hugh Bernard

Robert W. Kenny

Laurence P. Leite

David G. White

Benjamin Nimer, Chairman

J. Russell Mason, ex officio

ANNUAL REPORT

COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The Committee has been concerned with three matters during the course of this academic year. The first is a statement containing a list of suggestions or recommendations for study by this Committee transmitted to it by the President of the George Washington Chapter of the Association of American University Professors. The suggestions or recommendations are threefold: 1) the exploration of means to instill in the various components of the University appreciation for and adherence to the standards of the academic community; 2) attention to the problem of "creeping encroachment" of academic freedom through indirect methods; 3) the examination of the "content" of the academic responsibility of the faculty member. Specific areas of possible inquiry with respect to each are set forth. The Committee believes that these suggestions or recommendations call for study in depth and will undertake to give its attention to these during the course of the next academic year.

The second matter which the Committee has been considering relates to procedural aspects of the University's existing policy and practice concerning retirement. The Committee has drafted a statement and expects that by the end of the academic year this statement will have been finally approved by the Committee and will be presented to the Senate as a report.

The third topic under consideration by the Committee pertains to aspects of the proposed changes in the University's policy concerning retirement as submitted by the Subcommittee on Retirement. The Committee is evaluating the merits of these changes from the standpoint of matters normally encompassed by the Committee's jurisdiction. This includes certain aspects of the procedure necessary to effectuate the policy to be recommended by the Subcommittee on Retirement. Our recommendations will be forthcoming in due course.

Committee on Professional Ethics
and Academic Freedom

Gust A. Ledakis, Chairman
J. Forrester Davison
Michael Gasster
Nels D. Nelson
Mary L. Robbins

Calvin D. Linton, Dean of Columbia
College of Arts and Sciences,
ex officio

April 30, 1965

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL FACILITIES
OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, 1964-65

The Committee on Physical Facilities met four times during the academic year 1964-65. At its organization meeting the Committee determined that its purposes should be the consideration of the aesthetics and educational facilities of the University buildings and to make due recommendations concerning these aspects through the University Senate to the University Administration. The Committee also felt that there should be considerable continuity in its membership so that it might be able to make long range planning.

At the suggestion of the Executive Committee of the Senate and with the cooperation of the Office of the President, the Committee met with representatives of the architectural firm of Perkins and Will, which was making an architectural survey of the University facilities, on November 24, 1964. The principal objective of this survey was the preparation of a boundary plan for the University to be submitted to the National Capital Planning Commission. At a subsequent meeting the Committee members learned that the boundaries established in 1958, namely the area bounded by 19th and 24th Streets and F Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, are still considered valid for University use. Perkins and Will has also been making a study of land use for present and future buildings of the University within these boundaries. A more detailed discussion of the meeting with representatives of Perkins and Will was presented to the University Senate by the Committee Chairman on December 11, 1964.

The Committee is attempting to set up a joint meeting with the Senate Committees on Educational Policy and University Objectives at which Vice President John Anthony Brown has been requested to discuss the future plans of the University in regard to building and their relationship to educational policy. The purpose of such a meeting would be to garner information that could be passed on to the University Senate and the Faculty Assembly. Plans for such a meeting are not as yet complete, but it is expected that the meeting will be held in May 1965.

Annual Report of the Committee on Physical Facilities
of the University Senate, 1964-65, continued

-2-

Members of the Committee feel that there remains a sense of disquietude among the University faculty and students concerning the state of some existing physical facilities and that there is a lack of adequate communication concerning future building plans between the University Administration and the faculty and students. The Committee wishes to encourage vigorous and active physical planning by responsible members of the University with timely and periodic revelation of salient features such as priority of development, likelihood and possible timing of achievement. With the completion of each phase such as the educational planning, the actual incorporation of educational planning into physical facilities planning, and the resultant financial planning, it is strongly recommended that meaningful communication to Faculty and students ensue. The purpose of this recommendation is to contribute to a sense of well-being concerning the University's future and its academic standing. The Committee does not foresee nor does it expect that all problems facing the University can or will be resolved forthwith. It does believe that the fulfillment of planning effort over a future period of time, dependent as it is upon many factors, is more readily accepted as a condition if adequate communication of information concerning progress exists.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard C. Haskett
Donald C. Kline
Arthur S. Miller
Herbert E. Smith
Geza Teleki
Frank N. Miller, Chairman (sgd)

Separate statement of Professor Arthur S. Miller

I concur with the report of the Committee as submitted, but feel that it does not go far enough. Specifically, I recommend:

- (a) That existing facilities be surveyed to determine their adequacy in the light of the University's present and projected needs;
- (b) That a system of priorities be established in a phased program of realization of physical facility requirements;
- (c) That the Senate's Committee on Physical Facilities work closely with administrative officials in the accomplishment of the goals set out in the Committee report and the recommendations noted above.

Respectfully submitted,

(sgd) Arthur S. Miller
Professor of Law

22 April 1965

Report to the Senate

April 15, 1965

The Senate Committee on Research held formal meetings on November 16, 1963; December 14, 1964; February 1, 1965 and March 15, 1965. In addition the Committee held numerous informal discussions to agree on the following statements:

Teaching and research are the primary obligations of a university. The present report concerns the status of scholarly research in the sciences and the humanities in the University. We are living in an age of expanding knowledge, and more research funds are being made available to those institutions with facilities and personnel that promise fulfillment. Unless we act boldly, with imagination, and make plans for future expansion, our standing in the community will drop.

To accomplish these aims, our approach should center on the greater availability of time, facilities, funds and personnel for research. With greater emphasis on public relations, additional scholars interested in furthering the pursuit of knowledge would be attracted to our University.

1. Time. The committee gave considerable attention to the relationship between teaching and research efforts and to the question of teaching load as it may affect faculty research. It is a source of gratification to the Committee that all faculty requests for reduction of teaching schedules in order to further research efforts have been approved. However, the Committee believes that the "normal" 12 hour teaching schedule serves as a deterrent to faculty research and especially to the recruitment of new faculty with strong research interests. The Committee realizes that reduced teaching schedules will have varying impacts on the departments and that these impacts need examination department by department. The Committee therefore recommends to the Senate that the departments consider the effect on them of these alternatives:

- 2-
- A. A standard teaching schedule of 9 credit hours per semester, with selective reductions to 6 credit hours for approved research effort. Each department should examine its course offerings to see to what extent course consolidations and possible deletions may be feasible as a means of offsetting the cost of reduced teaching schedules.
 - B. A standard teaching schedule of 6 credit hours per semester, with faculty choice of (a) undertaking research or (b) teaching an additional course or two. This alternative stresses the element of free choice in the use of time over and above the standard 6 credit hour teaching schedule.

The Committee makes no recommendation in favor of one or the other alternative. A recommendation awaits study of the alternatives by the departments to ascertain (a) added costs, if any, (b) possible effects on departmental offerings, and (c) the respective interests in teaching and research on the part of departmental members.

2. Facilities. The building of laboratory, library and office facilities for carrying out research activities is imperative. The Committee recommends that the research facility needs of all the University Departments be canvassed systematically. We further recommend that the report of the Committee on the Science Center be implemented immediately. We recommend that special attention be paid to the maintenance and security of both new and old research facilities to minimize deterioration and obsolescence, and to improve the present scandalous condition of some research facilities.
3. Funds. Although there has been a recent increase in research funds allocated to the University Research Committee, additional funds are still necessary to permit that committee to perform the following functions:

- A. Provision of "seed money" for new investigators or new projects during the preparation of proposals for outside support.
 - B. Provision of support for faculty members eager to carry out research during the unsupported summer period. The Committee strongly recommends that special attention be given to money-raising efforts in order to provide unrestricted funds for these purposes.
4. Personnel. The Committee endorses the trend of appointing as full-time faculty eligible staff members of sponsored research projects associated with the University. While recognizing the financial limitations on the number of appointments, the Committee recommends acceleration of this trend to take advantage of available resources in building a faculty of teacher-researchers.
5. Public Relations. All research activities of the University should be systematically collected and publicized in university and other academic channels. Reports submitted by faculty members and reports of research should be periodically examined by the administration and by a "Scientific publicist" in the Public Relations office to encourage publication in the public press.

Respectfully submitted

(sgd) H. George Mandel, Chairman
Galip M. Arkilic
Ira H. Cisin
John T. Daily
Dolan H. Eargle, Jr.
Irving Kayton
James W. Robb
Arthur E. Burns, ex officio
Benjamin D. Van Evera, ex officio

THE REPORT OF THE RETIREMENT COMMITTEE

This Committee submitted its report at the March 12, 1965 meeting of the University Senate and copy of the report was attached to the minutes of that meeting.

By direction of the Chairman, this report will take the place of an Annual Report of the Sub-Committee on Retirement.

April 9, 1965

TO: Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Senate
Professor W. H. Kraus

FROM: The Public Ceremonies and Assemblies Committee
Chairman, Professor V. J. DeAngelis

SUBJECT: Committee Report

The committee had two occasions to meet with Dean Latimer during the academic year of 1964-65.

January 28th

Dean Latimer requested that I contact the members of the committee (by phone) and find out their reactions regarding the change of time for Convocation from the evening of February 22, to the morning of February 22, 1966.

This recommended change was brought about because Constitution Hall would not be available that evening but may be available that morning.

The members were contacted and all agreed to this change. In fact, they highly recommended that all Convocation exercises be held in the morning.

March 23rd

The committee met with Dean Latimer to discuss the following:

1. A new type of gown for Doctorate Degrees.
2. Student participation at Convocation.

The following action was taken:

1. Suggested that a sample of the new type of gown, George Washington University blue with buff trim on the collar, be made up and sent to Dr. Latimer so that we may see it in specified colors before recommending or rejecting it.
2. Recommended that:
 - (a) The honor students of each school or college (to be selected by Q.P.I.) be the student marshal.
 - (b) Each honor student lead his group into the student seating section.

- (c) Each honor student receive a diploma from the President of the University, on behalf of the graduates of his school or college, at the time the dean requests that the degrees be conferred.
- (d) The names of the honor students be listed in the program as "Student Marshals".

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd) V. J. DeAngelis, Physical Education, Chairman
L. P. Leggette, Speech
M. H. McClanahan, English
H. G. Detwiler, Education
G. M. Steiner, Music
J. F. Latimer, University Marshal, ex-officio

ANNUAL REPORT TO THE SENATE

Senate Committee on Student Relations

April 29, 1965

The Senate Committee on Student Relations has concentrated this past year on several problems within the large framework of student-faculty relations. At the same time, the Committee remained alert to student grievances and investigated those problems brought to the Committee's attention by student representatives. The areas where the Committee assumed responsibility include:

1. Student-Faculty Relations Within Student Clubs & Organizations

The Committee agreed to undertake a survey to determine the role of faculty advisers in student organizations. The Student Liaison Committee has collected the necessary factual information by submitting questionnaires to the presidents of student organizations and by following this procedure with an interview. After the interviews are completed, the data will be analyzed and presented to the Senate.

2. Psychiatric Counseling

Another problem which the Committee considered was the increasing demand for psychiatric counseling services to students and the creation of psychological tests to be administered to incoming freshmen. After contacting Dr. E. Lakin Phillips, Director of the University Testing and Counseling Services, the Committee learned that the Center is planning to enlarge its activities and to prepare a freshmen psychological test series. Dr. Weisberg, a Committee member, will work with the Center on this testing program.

3. Recreational and Study Facilities

The serious shortage of recreational and study facilities was another area under the Committee's investigation. Professor Hill was charged with the responsibility of examining what facilities are available and could be made available to students for use as study and recreational rooms. The purpose of the survey which he conducted was to determine whether students, now using the fourth floor of the Student Union as a study hall, would be equally satisfied to study at the library if the Library offered comparable facilities. The survey yielded the tentative conclusions that about one-half of the students from those sampled use the fourth floor every day and that, irrespective of the frequency with which they use the room, about one-half of them prefer to stay there. The full report is available to the Senate for further consideration.

The Committee was informed that the Student Government had formed a Special Committee on Commuter Problems to analyze the difficulties non-resident and part-time students face, e.g., parking, eating, overnights, study facilities and lockers for books. A report of the Student Committee's work will be made available to the Senate.

4. Student Complaints

Student representatives brought to the Committee's attention specific complaints about shortcomings in the School of Government curriculum in International Affairs. At the Committee's suggestion, Professor Hill arranged a meeting with Deans Stout, Williams, and several students, and discussed the possibility of making the curriculum more flexible by increasing the number of elective courses. In the revision of the International Affairs curriculum, these suggestions will be considered. In addition, plans were announced at this meeting to increase the number of curriculum advisers and to streamline advising procedures.

The Committee wishes to acknowledge the support and cooperation of all its members and the representatives of the Student Liaison Committee, and looks forward to the successful completion of the projects outlined above.